

ADAM G. GASNER (SBN 201234)
Law Chambers Building
345 Franklin Street
San Francisco, CA 94102
Telephone: 415-782-6000
Facsimile: 415-241-7340
E-Mail: adam@gasnerlaw.com

VALERY NECHAY (SBN 314752)
Law Chambers Building
345 Franklin Street
San Francisco, CA 94102
Telephone: 415-652-8569
E-Mail: valerynechaylaw@gmail.com

Attorneys for Defendant
YEVGENIY ALEXANDROVICH NIKULIN

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

YEVGENIY ALEXANDROVICH NIKULIN,

Defendant.

No. CR-16-00440 WHA

**DEFENDANT'S MOTION IN LIMINE
NO. 3 PURSUANT TO FED. R. 403 TO
EXCLUDE THE GOVERNMENT
FROM MAKING REFERENCE TO MR.
NIKULIN'S FINANCES AND
LIFESTYLE**

INTRODUCTION

Defendant YEVGENIY ALEXANDROVICH NIKULIN ("Mr. Nikulin") is charged by indictment with three counts of computer intrusion (Counts One, Four, and Seven), in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1030(a)(2)(C); two counts of intentional transmission of information, code, or

1 command, causing damage to a protected computer (Counts Two and Eight), in violation of 18
 2 U.S.C. § 1030(a)(5)(A); two counts of aggravated identity theft (Counts Three and Nine), in
 3 violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1028A(a)(1); one count of trafficking in unauthorized access devices
 4 (Count Six), in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1029(a)(2); and one count of conspiracy (Count Five), in
 5 violation of 18 U.S.C. § 371.
 6

7 A pretrial conference is set in this case for February 26, 2020 with a jury trial set for March
 8 9, 2020.

9 MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

10 In this case the evidence produced by the government includes information that Mr. Nikulin
 11 was arrested while traveling in the Czech Republic, there are photographs of him with exotic cars
 12 and eating in what appear to be high-end restaurants. In this case, the government is accusing Mr.
 13 Nikulin of computer related crimes for financial gain and evidence of his previous lifestyle prior to
 14 his arrest has a likelihood of prejudicing a trier of fact against Mr. Nikulin while offering no
 15 probative value.
 16

17 Fed. R. Evid. 401 defines relevant evidence as evidence that has any tendency to make a
 18 fact that is of consequence in determining the action more or less probable than it would be without
 19 the evidence. Here evidence of his interest in travel or the cars Mr. Nikulin may have driven or the
 20 restaurants he frequented are not probative of any elements of the crimes for which he is charged
 21 and are irrelevant. Rule 402 provides that irrelevant evidence is not admissible. Rule 403 provides
 22 that the court may exclude relevant evidence “if its probative value is substantially outweighed by
 23 the danger of . . . unfair prejudice, confusion of the issues, misleading the jury, undue delay,
 24 wasting time, or needless presenting cumulative evidence.” District courts have wide discretion in
 25 determining the admissibility of evidence under the Federal Rules, particularly with respect to Rule
 26
 27
 28

403, since it requires an “on-the-spot balancing of probative value and prejudice.” *Sprint/United Management Co. v. Mendelsohn*, 552 U.S. 379, 384 (2008).

The only way this evidence could have any probative value would be if the government first proves that: (1) Mr. Nikulin personally purchased the items that allegedly reflect Mr. Nikulin’s “lavish lifestyle”; and (2) the funds used to purchase those items in fact came from the alleged cybercrime conspiracy, rather than from some other source of income. Even if these necessary predicates could be established, evidence about Mr. Nikulin's alleged purchases would create such a high risk of unfair prejudice, jury confusion, tangential detours, and mini trials, that it should still be precluded under Rule 403.

Therefore, any evidence suggesting Mr. Nikulin had an opulent lifestyle is highly inflammatory; this evidence would cause jurors to speculate about issues unrelated to the charges in the indictment. But particularly in a case where the Government alleges financial wrongdoing, the jury could quickly be swayed by images of exotic cars, fancy looking vacations and high-end restaurants. In short, Mr. Nikulin runs a risk of being convicted for his lifestyle rather than the conduct charged in the Indictment.

Courts routinely hold that evidence and argument concerning a party's resources, wealth, and related matters are wholly irrelevant, highly prejudicial, and thus a proper subject for a motion *in limine*. See *Geddes v. United Fin. Grp.*, 559 F.2d 557, 560 (9th Cir. 1977) (“[T]he ability of defendant to pay the necessary damages may inject into the damage determination a foreign, diverting, and distracting issue which may effectuate a prejudicial result.”); *In re Homestore, Inc., C.D. California*, 2011 WL 291176, at *1 (“Evidence of a party's financial condition is generally not relevant and can be unduly prejudicial, as it can distract the jury from the real issues in the case.”).

1 *See, e.g., Papadopoulos v. Fred Meyer Stores, Inc.*, 2006 WL 3249195, at *2 (W.D. Wash. Nov. 8,
2 2006) (granting motion *in limine* to exclude “evidence or argument regarding defendant's financial
3 condition.”)

4
5 **CONCLUSION**

6 Accordingly, pursuant to Fed. R. Evid. 401- 403, Mr. Nikulin respectfully requests that the
7 Court exclude evidence of his personal finances or lifestyle as irrelevant and prejudicial.

8
9 DATED: January 29, 2020

10 /s/ Adam Gasner

11 Adam G. Gasner, Esq.

12 Attorney for Defendant

YEVGENIY ALEXANDROVICH NIKULIN

13 DATED: January 29, 2020

14 /s/ Valery Nechay

15 Valery Nechay, Esq.

16 Attorney for Defendant

17 YEVGENIY ALEXANDROVICH NIKULIN
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28